

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-33 are pending in the subject application prior to entry of this Amendment. By the Amendment herewith, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to remove the feature of the summons comprising an “agenda”. Applicant also has amended independent claim 1 to recite, in part, that the summons:

- (i) is drawn up “in such a way that the information regarding the conference call is found at the same points in the summons” – basis can be drawn from page 2, lines 13-17 of the specification;
- (ii) includes “the telephone number of the convener” and that the respective participants made their call using the telephone number of the convener mentioned in the summons – basis for these features can be drawn from page 2, lines 20-23 of the specification; and
- (iii) clarifying that the convener device performs the joining of the participants to the conference call.

Applicant has also made corresponding amendments to the other independent claims for consistency with amended independent claim 1. It is respectfully pointed out that amendments set forth herein are also based on the granted European counterpart application claims.

Applicant has also added a new claim 34 based upon original claim 6.

Additionally, Applicant has changed “where” to “wherein” in the claims consistent with US patent practice. It is respectfully noted that this clarification is not made for reasons related to patentability and the full range of equivalents should remain intact.

No new matter is introduced into the subject application.

Accordingly, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-5 and 7-34 are pending. Of those claims, claims 1, 15, 27, 30, 32 and 33 remain independent.

Referring now to the outstanding non-final Office Action, claims 15-26 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 USC Section 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The above rejection is respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

In the interest of advancing the prosecution of the subject application, independent claims 15 and 30 are clarified, as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Regarding the rejections based upon art, claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-16, 18-22, 24, 27 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being obvious over Kleier (US 2002/0009990) in view of Scheuring (US 20020131565). Dependent claims 5, 11, 12, 17, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleier in view of Scheuring, and further in view of Wu (US Patent 6,275,575). Lastly, dependent claims 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being obvious over Kleier.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the above rejections.

Kleier does not disclose providing information (included in the summons) at the same points in the summons. In contrast, Kleier discloses utilizing a virtual bridge or virtual conference number that is provided in the summons (see paragraph 33). This reference does not disclose providing the actual telephone number of the convener to participants as part of the summons.

More particularly, the participants of Kleier are joined to the conference call by dialing that specific virtual number (see paragraph 33). This joining to the call is performed by an intermediary bridge/server (see the Figure 10 of Kleier). The participants are therefore not joined to the conference call automatically by the mobile terminal of the convener as in embodiments of Applicant's claimed invention.

Scheuring relates to methods of scheduling calendars/calendar items (see paragraph 2). This

reference does not relate to conference calls, as in the subject claimed invention.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not look to this reference for guidance as Scheuring concerns an entirely separate field and does not relate to or describe any of the features of the claimed invention.

In view of the above, it is clear that all of Applicant's independent claims are new in view of the cited art.

Moreover, it is respectfully asserted that all of Applicant's independent claims are also non-obvious in view of the cited art and thus help to provide for distinct advantages over the teaching of the prior art.

For example, by providing the information of the summons at the same points in the summons to the meeting, it is possible to enable consistent picking up of the desired information from the received summons by the user. For instance, the user can know exactly where relevant information can be found in each summons, or even an application in the participants' mobile terminal/device can be utilized to pick up the information concerning the conference call given the consistent form of the summons. Ultimately, this feature can provide the telephone conference call information in a clear and understandable format for the participant.

In addition, according to embodiments of the claimed invention, the telephone number of the convener (rather than a virtual telephone conference number/bridge number) is included. The participants can call this number and be connected directly to the mobile terminal convener, which then performs the conference call joining itself. This does not require a bridge or server to allow for a conference call to be created, as the mobile terminal of the convener performs the joining itself.

Kleier requires a virtual conference to be set up. In contrast, the present independent claims allow for, for instance,:

- (a) ease of use as any participant device capable of making a one-to-one telephone call can be joined to the telephone conference call; and
- (b) improved practicality and ease of use over the prior art, as no virtual conference or server is needed to allow for conferencing, given that the calls can be joined together by and in the convener device.

In view of the above, Applicant's independent claims provide for distinct advantages over the cited art and are not suggested by the cited art. Moreover, there is no reason to combine and modify the teachings of the cited references in an attempt to arrive at the subject matter set forth in these claims, and thus these claims are non-obvious in view of the teachings of the cited art.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, all of Applicant's independent claims are new and non-obvious in view of the cited art. As all independent claims are patentable, all remaining dependent claims also are patentable at least in view of their dependency from an allowable independent claim.

All issues having been addressed, the subject application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections. A Notice of Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions, a call to the undersigned attorney would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine Wilkes Beninati Aug 4, 2010
Christine Wilkes Beninati Date
Reg. No.: 37,967

Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, ATTORNEYS AT LAW LLC Phone: (203) 925-9400